NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS

California Rules of Court, rule 977(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 977(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 977.

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA FIFTH APPELLATE DISTRICT

In re HECTOR E., A Person Coming Under the Juvenile Court Law.

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

HECTOR E., A Person Coming Under the F038881

(Super. Ct. No. 95784-5)

OPINION

THE COURT*

APPEAL from a judgment of the Superior Court of Fresno County. M. Bruce Smith, Judge.

Gregory L.Cannon, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Defendant and Appellant.

Bill Lockyer, Attorney General, Robert R. Anderson, Chief Assistant Attorney General, Jo Graves, Assistant Attorney General, and Carlos A. Martinez, Deputy Attorney General, for Plaintiff and Respondent.

-00O00-

Defendant and Appellant.

^{*}Before Dibiaso, A.P.J., Vartabedian, J., and Harris, J.

Appellant, Hector E., was originally adjudged a ward of the court (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 602) on December 15, 1999, for second degree burglary. On August 11, 2000, the court readjudged Hector a ward of the court after he admitted allegations charging him with battery (Pen. Code, § 242). On August 8, 2001, appellant admitted violating his probation (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 777) by leaving the group home where he had been placed. On August 30, 2001, the court set Hector's maximum term of confinement at three years two months and committed him to the Elkhorn Bootcamp Program for a period not to exceed 365 days.

Hector's appellate counsel has filed a brief which summarizes the facts, with citations to the record, raises no issues, and asks this court to independently review the record. (*People* v. *Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436.) Hector has not responded to this court's invitation to submit additional briefing.

Following independent review of the record we find that no reasonably arguable factual or legal issues exist.

The judgment is affirmed.